

REMARKS

The Office Action mailed June 6, 2007 considered claims 1-21 and 24-54. Claim 1 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the enablement requirement and written description requirements. Claims 1-12, 14-21, 24-26, 54 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Jenkins et al.* (US 6,678,682) hereinafter *Jenkins* in view of *Sullivan et al.* (US 2002/0085579) hereinafter *Sullivan*, and further in view of *Jacobson et al.* (US 5,440,744) hereinafter *Jacobson*. Claims 27-36, 39, 41-53 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Jenkins, Sullivan, Jacobson* in view of *Langford et al.* (US 6,470,450) hereinafter *Langford*. Claims 37-38, 40 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Jenkins, Sullivan, Jacobson, Langford* in view of *Shigetomi et al.* (US 2002/0055951) hereinafter *Shigetomi*. Claim 13 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Jenkins, Sullivan, Jacobson* in view of *Robotham et al.* (US 2002/0015042) hereinafter *Robotham*.¹

By this paper, claims 1, 27, and 52 have been amended. Claims 1-21 and 24-54 remain pending in the application.

As a preliminary matter, Applicants would like to thank the Examiner for the courtesies extended during the telephonic interview held August 28, 2007. Details of that interview are included herein below.

Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. 112

Claim 1 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the enablement requirement and written description requirements. In particular, the Office Action states that "modifying access control data" was not described in the specification in such a way as to enable one skilled in the art to make and use the invention or that the inventors had possession of the claimed invention. Applicant has amended Claim 1 to recite "altering access control rules" as the claims have been interpreted by the Examiner as indicated on Page 3 of the Office Action.

Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. 103

¹ Although the prior art status of the cited art is not being challenged at this time, Applicant reserves the right to challenge the prior art status of the cited art at any appropriate time, should it arise. Accordingly, any arguments and amendments made herein should not be construed as acquiescing to any prior art status of the cited art.

The application is generally directed methods and systems which allow several different applications to operate on the same data, where the data is related to a particular identity. This is accomplished through the use of a unique and novel data object organized into a data structure according to a schema recognized by the several different applications, such that the several different applications can interpret the data by following rules in the schema. Further, the identity has the ability to control access privileges associated with the data related to the identity. The identity can control access privileges associated with the data by altering access control rules in the data structure. Each of the claims recite methods (claims 1 and 27), systems (claim 52) or computer program products (claims 24 and 48) which include this functionality.

The art cited in the present Office Action, in direct contrast, fails to show at least "a data object organized into a data structure according to a schema recognized by the plurality of applications, such that the plurality of applications can interpret the data object by following rules in the schema" as is now recited by the claims of the present application. Further, the art cited fails to show "[a] network message includes an identification of the identity and an identification of the schema" as is also recited by the claims of the application.

In particular, the only art cited in the Office Action that discusses schemas whatsoever is Jenkins. However, Jenkins teaches a system that is in direct contradiction with the elements claimed. Jenkins teaches that each application has its own schema, rather than having a schema recognized by a plurality of applications, such that the plurality of applications can interpret the data object by following rules in the schema. Specifically Jenkins teaches defining an access control schema for *each* application (col. 4, lines 37-39). Further, Jenkins teaches that each application can provide or update its access control schema (col. 4, lines 56-58), further solidifying the notation that Jenkins teaches a schema for each application rather than a schema recognized by the plurality of applications, such that the plurality of applications can interpret the data object by following rules in the schema. Claim 1 of Jenkins provides further evidence of the differences between the present application and Jenkins. In particular, Jenkins at col. 7. lines 38 and 39 recites "receiving *respective* access management control schema from a plurality of registered applications..." (emphasis added). Jenkins further teaches storing an association between applications and their schema. See Jenkins at col. 7. lines 40-43. Thus, it is clear that not only does Jenkins not teach what is recited by the claims of the present application, Jenkins teaches a system that is directly contrary to what is recited. In particular, while the claims of the

application focus on identity based identification and control of data, Jenkins focuses on application level control of data.

Additionally, the Office Action cites to *Sullivan* for showing modifying access control data in the data structure. Applicants specifically traverse this characterization of *Sullivan*. *Sullivan* appears to teach providing flexibility with automatic preference settings [0007], but does not appear to teach granting or retracting authorizations by altering access control rules in the data structure as is now recited. Rather *Sullivan* appears to only show personal preference settings without any authorization control rules. Applicants request that the Examiner point to a specific portion of *Sullivan* where authorization is granted or retracted.

In view of the foregoing, Applicant respectfully submits that the other rejections to the claims are now moot and do not, therefore, need to be addressed individually at this time. It will be appreciated, however, that this should not be construed as Applicant acquiescing to any of the purported teachings or assertions made in the last action regarding the cited art or the pending application, including any official notice. Instead, Applicant reserves the right to challenge any of the purported teachings or assertions made in the last action at any appropriate time in the future, should the need arise. Furthermore, to the extent that the Examiner has relied on any Official Notice, explicitly or implicitly, Applicant specifically requests that the Examiner provide references supporting the teachings officially noticed, as well as the required motivation or suggestion to combine the relied upon notice with the other art of record.

In the event that the Examiner finds remaining impediment to a prompt allowance of this application that may be clarified through a telephone interview, the Examiner is requested to contact the undersigned attorney at (801) 533-9800.

Dated this 6th day of September, 2007.

Respectfully submitted,



RICK D. NYDEGGER
Registration No. 28,651
J. LAVAR OLDHAM
Registration No. 53,409
Attorneys for Applicant
Customer No. 47973